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Results in Brief: Training Requirements for U.S. Ground Forces Deploying in Support of Operation Iraqi Freedom

What We Did
Our overall audit objective was to determine whether U.S. ground forces supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom received training necessary to meet operational requirements. Specifically, we determined whether requirements reflect the training necessary in the area of operation. This is the second in a series of reports addressing training for U.S. ground forces supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom.

What We Found
Combatant commanders are responsible for giving authoritative direction to subordinate commands and forces, while coordinating and approving the training necessary to carry out missions assigned to the command.

U.S. Central Command requires that all personnel deploying in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom be trained in 14 areas, including the defeat of improvised explosive devices, land navigation, and rules of engagement. The Services incorporated the 14 theater-specific training areas into their predeployment and annual training requirements. In addition, the Services effectively used a variety of means, such as lessons learned and input from units, to update predeployment training exercises. As a result, the Services provided realistic, theater-inspired training for units deploying in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Client Comments
We provided a draft of this report on March 17, 2008. No written response to this report was required, and none was received. Therefore, we are publishing this report in final form.

A simulated improvised explosive device emits a firestorm as soldiers experience the concussion and noise of an explosion during training.  
Photo Courtesy of U.S. Army
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Introduction

Objectives
Our overall audit objective was to determine whether U.S. ground forces supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) received training necessary to meet operational requirements. Specifically, we determined whether requirements reflect the training necessary in the area of operation. This is the second in a series of reports addressing training requirements for ground forces supporting OIF. See Appendix A for a discussion of the audit scope and methodology and prior coverage related to the audit objectives.

Background

DoD Policy on Military Training
DoD Directive 5100.1, “Functions of the DoD and Its Major Components,” August 1, 2002, states that Military Services are responsible for developing Service training, doctrines, procedures, tactics, and techniques. In addition, DoD Directive 1322.18, “Military Training,” September 3, 2004, requires that training resemble the conditions of actual operations and be responsive to the needs of the combatant commanders. Combatant commanders are responsible for giving authoritative direction to subordinate commands and forces, while coordinating and approving the training necessary to carry out missions assigned to the command.

U.S. Central Command
U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) is one of the Secretary of Defense’s nine worldwide combatant commands. The mission of CENTCOM is to conduct operations that attack, disrupt, and defeat terrorism and to protect vital interests of the United States in the CENTCOM area of responsibility: the Middle East. The goal of CENTCOM in Iraq is to help establish a representative government that upholds the rule of law, respects the rights of its people, provides security, and is an ally in the War on Terror.

U.S. Army Forces Command and U.S. Army, Europe
U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM) trains, mobilizes, and deploys combat-ready Army National Guard, Army Reserve, and active-duty soldiers in the continental United States. First U.S. Army, a three-star command under FORSCOM, is responsible for the training, mobilization, and deployment support for reserve component units in FORSCOM. U.S. Army, Europe provides oversight and training to units stationed in the European theater.

Navy Expeditionary Combat Command
The Navy Expeditionary Combat Command serves as the single functional command for the Navy’s expeditionary forces. The Navy Expeditionary Combat Command has responsibility to staff, train, and equip Navy expeditionary forces. The Navy also
deployed individual augmentee sailors to support Army missions. Individual augmentees are active-duty or reserve sailors with needed skills that are deployed to assist another command or Service. The Navy’s Expeditionary Combat Readiness Center directly assists these sailors by coordinating with the Army to ensure they get the proper stateside training.

**Air Force Security Forces and Second Air Force**

The Air Force Director of Security Forces develops policy for training security force units, the largest and most frequently deployed ground combat unit for the Air Force. The Air Force Security Forces Center provides guidance to the Air Force major commands on implementing security forces training and monitors all security forces training programs.

The Air Force also provides units to support other Service missions, which are often referred to as In-Lieu-Of missions. For these missions, the Air Force provides forces capable of carrying out a mission that would normally come under another Service’s core mission. Second Air Force, which falls under the Air Education and Training Command, is responsible for conducting basic military and technical training for Air Force personnel and provides oversight to the training of airmen supporting In-Lieu-Of missions.

**Marine Corps Training and Education Command**

The Marine Corps Training and Education Command is responsible for developing, coordinating, resourcing, executing, and evaluating training to ensure Marines are prepared to meet the challenges of operating environments. The Marine Corps Training and Education Command is the higher headquarters for the Marine Air Ground Task Force Training Command, which has responsibility for the administration and conduct of live-fire, combined arms training of active and reserve units.

**Review of Internal Controls**

We determined that the internal controls over the training for U.S. ground forces supporting OIF were sufficient to ensure that Service training programs adequately reflected the training necessary for the CENTCOM area of operation. The Services had adequate processes and procedures in place to incorporate mandatory CENTCOM training into their own predeployment and annual training requirements.
Training Requirements for Operation Iraqi Freedom Deployments

CENTCOM requires that all personnel deploying in support of OIF be trained in 14 areas, including the defeat of improvised explosive devices, land navigation, and rules of engagement. The Services incorporated these 14 theater-specific areas into their predeployment and annual training requirements. In addition, the Services effectively collected information from a variety of sources and regularly updated predeployment training. As a result, the Services provided realistic, theater-inspired training for units deploying in support of OIF.

Incorporating CENTCOM Requirements in Service Training


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2005 CENTCOM Required Training for OIF and Operation Enduring Freedom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Anti-terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Media awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Nuclear, biological, and chemical personal protective measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Services have incorporated these mandatory training tasks into annual or predeployment training requirements.

1During our review, on October 15, 2007, CENTCOM updated the training guidance for FY 2008 by adding 15 training requirements. We used the FY 2005 guidance for our review.
**Army Training Requirements**

The Army incorporated mandatory CENTCOM training into predeployment training requirements. Since July 2003, FORSCOM has updated training guidance\(^2\) as necessary for unit commanders preparing to deploy from the continental United States. This guidance includes training requirements for units deploying in support of OIF. Units deploying from the continental United States must comply with the requirements in FORSCOM guidance when training for deployment.

The FORSCOM guidance also applies to Navy individual augmentees and Air Force In-Lieu-Of units. Navy individual augmentees and Air Force In-Lieu-Of units train at Army mobilization stations when preparing for deployment to OIF. Training at the mobilization stations is prescribed by FORSCOM. FORSCOM training guidance includes all the mandatory CENTCOM training.

For Army units deploying from the European theater, U.S. Army, Europe issued an Operations Order dated June 12, 2004. The Order includes an annex that specifies training requirements and includes all the mandatory CENTCOM training for OIF deployment.

**Navy Training Requirements**

The Navy incorporated mandatory CENTCOM training into its training requirements. The Navy deploys four types of expeditionary ground combat units in support of OIF: Riverines, Seabees, Explosive Ordnance Disposal, and Maritime Expeditionary Security Forces. Navy instructions and manuals provide training guidance for these units deploying in support of OIF, while the units’ missions dictate how the units will train.

Various Navy instructions and manuals establish annual and predeployment training requirements for sailors. Secretary of the Navy instructions require training on 7 of the 14 CENTCOM requirements. For example, Secretary of the Navy Instruction 3300.1B, “Law of Armed Conflict (Law of War) Program to Ensure Compliance by the Naval Establishment,” December 27, 2005, requires all Navy personnel to receive training and education in the law of armed conflict.

Chief of Naval Operations instructions require training on five additional CENTCOM requirements, including weapons qualification. These instructions provide additional guidance regarding regulatory briefings and combat stress and suicide prevention, which are also required by Secretary of the Navy Instructions. Finally, Navy Personnel Manual 18068F, “Manual of Navy Enlisted Manpower and Personnel Classifications and

---

Occupations Standards, Volume 1,” October 2003, requires training on the remaining two CENTCOM training requirements, including nuclear, biological, and chemical personal protective measures and first aid tasks.

**Air Force Training Requirements**

The Air Force incorporated mandatory CENTCOM training in annual and predeployment training requirements for Security Forces. Air Force instructions and an Air Force handbook provide guidance for annual and predeployment training requirements. Lesson plans for security force units also provide guidance for predeployment training.


Standardized lesson plans prescribe most of the training that Security Forces units receive at RTCs. The Air Force developed these 21 lesson plans to provide a standardized course of instruction for Security Forces units on topics such as land navigation, improvised explosive device recognition, and rules of engagement. These lesson plans account for five of the mandatory CENTCOM training areas, including combat lifesaver, which is not required by Air Force instructions or handbooks.

**Marine Corps Training Requirements**

The Marine Corps incorporated mandatory CENTCOM training in predeployment training requirements. A commander message and a Marine Corps manual provide training guidance for Marines deploying in support of OIF.

On July 6, 2005, the Commander, I Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF) issued “I MEF Predeployment Training Requirements for OIF 05-07” (hereafter I MEF Training Requirements) as guidance for units training for operations and missions in Iraq. The I MEF Training Requirements include training on 11 of the 14 mandatory CENTCOM training areas, including use of force, prevention of combat stress and suicide, and law of war.

Navy Marine Corps 3500.18, “Marine Corps Common Skills (Vol. 1) Training and Readiness Manual” (hereafter the Manual), June 21, 2007, establishes core training requirements for Marines, including knowledge of first aid tasks and combat stress and suicide prevention. The Manual requires training on five of the mandatory CENTCOM training areas, three of which are not required by the I MEF Training Requirements, including nuclear, biological, and chemical personal protective measures; land navigation; and regulatory briefings.
Using Lessons Learned and Input From Units To Update Service Training

The Services effectively collected theater information from lessons learned and deployed and returning units, to update predeployment training exercises. The updated exercises gave units the opportunity to train in current theater situations in a realistic, yet controlled, environment.

Lessons Learned

The Army and Marine Corps collected information during military operations and used that information to update training. The Center for Army Lessons Learned has personnel deployed to Iraq to collect lessons from theater. These people disseminate information to their Center for Army Lessons Learned counterparts at the Army maneuver combat training centers, who in turn communicate the information to trainers. The Center for Army Lessons Learned also publishes the information on the Web for trainers. Sharing these lessons with trainers ensures training includes the most current tactics, techniques, and procedures to prepare units going through predeployment training.

The Marine Corps Center for Lessons Learned also deploys personnel to Iraq to learn the latest tactics, techniques, and procedures. While in Iraq, these personnel compile weekly reports. The Marine Corps Center for Lessons Learned receives these reports and distributes them to the Marine Corps training centers.

Input From Deployed and Returning Units

Services solicited feedback from units in Iraq and redeployed units to update training to simulate theater conditions. The Services obtained this feedback through predeployment site surveys, regular communication with personnel in Iraq, and informal canvassing throughout deployment cycles. The Services used this information to create a realistic training atmosphere for units preparing to deploy in support of OIF.

- **Predeployment Site Surveys.** The Army conducted predeployment site surveys to update predeployment training. Predeployment site surveys are fact-finding visits in which commanders take staff members to theater and meet with the units they will be replacing. The predeployment site survey allows commanders to learn more about the mission they will support. Commanders use the information they collect from these visits to update predeployment training to simulate theater conditions.

- **Communication With Personnel in Iraq.** The Navy collected additional information on ground combat missions through feedback from sailors returning from OIF and regular phone calls and e-mails to Navy personnel in Iraq. Training centers incorporated the information in predeployment training. For example, trainers used information obtained from Explosive Ordnance Disposal theater detachments to gain insight when developing training scenarios. Explosive Ordnance Disposal trainers designed realistic
training scenarios that included new trigger mechanisms used in improvised explosive devices. Trainers incorporated the information into training in as little as a few days and shared the information with other Navy ground combat missions and Services.

- **Canvassing Throughout Deployment Cycles.** The Air Force canvassed airmen at three points during training and deployment. Second Air Force personnel collected information when airmen arrived at the Air Force training location, when they completed training, and again 30 to 60 days into deployment. The information that Second Air Force collected was related to the adequacy of training and equipment. This information helped Second Air Force make necessary changes to predeployment training for In-Lieu-Of units.

**Realistic Training Atmosphere**

The Services used information collected from Iraq and from ground force units to create a realistic training atmosphere for units preparing to deploy in support of OIF. Mission rehearsal exercises were conducted at Army and Marine Corps training centers under realistic conditions that induced combat stress. For example, the Army and Marine Corps constructed mock Iraqi cities at training centers and hired local cultural role players, some of Iraqi descent. These practices allowed units to meet CENTCOM training requirements such as country orientation briefings, rules of engagement, and use of force, while engaging in realistic combat scenarios. During these exercises, soldiers and Marines tested their knowledge of rules of engagement and use of force by interacting with role players rather than learning the rules from presentations and briefings.

Army training centers also incorporated first aid and combat lifesaver requirements during predeployment mission rehearsal exercises. The training centers employed local citizens and used makeup and other special effects to simulate wounds from explosions. Soldiers had to administer first aid and employ combat lifesaving techniques on “wounded” citizens and soldiers under stressful combat conditions.

**Summary**

The Services not only incorporated mandatory CENTCOM training in their predeployment and annual training requirements, but also incorporated these requirements into hands-on training exercises. The Services collected information from a variety of sources to capture theater-specific lessons and effectively used this information to update training. By incorporating mandatory CENTCOM training along with information collected from theater, the Services provided units with challenging, real-life training scenarios. As a result, the Services created realistic, theater-inspired training for units deploying in support of OIF.
Appendix A. Scope and Methodology

We conducted this performance audit from January to July 2007 and October 2007 through January 2008 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

We identified mandatory CENTCOM training and reviewed Service training requirements to determine whether the Services incorporated the mandatory CENTCOM training. We reviewed documentation, including CENTCOM and Military Service instructions, memoranda, handbooks, manuals, and other training guidance. Publication dates of these documents ranged from October 1992 through October 2007. During site visits, we interviewed officials from U.S. unified commands and all of the Military Services regarding predeployment training and training requirements. Officials we visited and interviewed were from the following locations:

- U.S. Central Command
- U.S. Joint Forces Command
- Army Central Command
- U.S. Army, Europe
- U.S. Army Forces Command
- U.S. Army Reserve Command
- First U.S. Army
- Army National Guard
- Army Training and Doctrine Command
- Joint Multinational Training Command
- Combined Arms Center
- Center for Army Lessons Learned
- National Training Center
- Joint Readiness Training Center
- Joint Multinational Readiness Center
- Office of the Chief of Naval Operations
- Navy Expeditionary Combat Command
- Expeditionary Combat Readiness Center
- Air Combat Command
- Air National Guard
- Second Air Force
- Air Education and Training Command
- Headquarters, Air Force Security Forces
- Air Force Center for Lessons Learned
- Marine Corps Training and Education Command
- Marine Corps Center for Lessons Learned
- Marine Air Ground Task Force Training Command

Use of Computer-Processed Data

We did not use computer-processed data to perform this audit.

---

3We suspended this project from July to October 2007 because of resource constraints.
Prior Coverage
During the last 5 years, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Department of Defense Inspector General (DoD IG), and the U.S. Army Audit Agency have issued nine reports discussing military training and training requirements. Unrestricted GAO reports can be accessed over the Internet at http://www.gao.gov. Unrestricted DoD IG reports can be accessed over the Internet at http://www.dodig.mil/audit/reports. Unrestricted Army Audit Agency reports can be accessed at https://www.aaa.army.mil/reports.htm.
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